

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 13, 14, 25, and 26 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or added. Hence, Claims 1-36 are pending in the Application.

The examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed October 3, 2003 is addressed hereinafter.

I. REJECTION BASED ON 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Office Action has rejected Claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McManis (U.S. Pat. No. 5,757,914).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In a proper rejection under § 102(e) the cited reference must show each and every claimed feature in the same combination as arranged in the claim. See Lewmar Marine, Inc. v. Barient, Inc., 827 F.2d 744, 747-48, 3 USPQ2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987). If even a single element or limitation is missing from the reference, anticipation is not found. Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 722 F.2d 1542, 1548, 220 USPQ 193, 198 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Claims 1, 13, and 25 have been amended to clarify the invention and appear as follows:

1. A method of securely invoking an access control function, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a digital signature for the access control function;
generating a mapping of the access control function to the digital
signature;
determining that the digital signature is mapped to the access control
function based on the mapping when execution of the access
control function is requested;
determining whether an executable element matches the access control
function based on the digital signature;
executing the executable element only when the executable element
matches the access control function; and
wherein a particular class defines an implementation of the access control
function.

13. A computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of one or more instructions for securely invoking an access control function, the one or more sequences of one or more instructions including instructions which, when executed by one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to perform the steps of:
receiving a digital signature for the access control function;
generating a mapping of the access control function to the digital
signature;
determining that the digital signature is mapped to the access control
function based on the mapping when execution of the access
control function is requested;

determining whether an executable element matches the access control function based on the digital signature;
executing the executable element only when the executable element matches the access control function; and
wherein a particular class defines an implementation of the access control function.

25. An access control system, comprising:
a processor;
a memory coupled to the processor;
a first mapping that maps each of a set of access control functions to a digital signature of that access control function;
the processor configured to retrieve an executable element in response to a request to execute a first access control function;
the processor configured to determine whether the executable element matches the first access control function based on the digital signature;
the processor configured to execute the executable element when the executable element matches the first access control function; and
wherein the set of access control functions are each implemented in a class.

Claims 1, 13, and 25 have been amended to include an element of Claims 2, 14, and 26, respectively. Therefore, Applicant will comment on the Office Action's rejections of the included element of said claims. In particular, McManis does not disclose a system wherein a particular class defines an implementation of the access control function as claimed in the invention. The Office action states:

“wherein a particular class defines an implementation for the access control function; ... is inherent in McManis, because McManis discloses each application program object instance includes an object header, at least one digital signature, and a main application procedure, called a method (see col. 3, lines 8-25). The Examiner asserts that McManis discloses a class because McManis discloses a method.”

The Office Action states that McManis discloses a method. However McManis' method is the main application procedure that is being accessed, *i.e.*, called by another procedure. Col. 3, lines 8-17 state:

“As shown in FIG. 1, in a preferred embodiment of the invention each application program object instance includes an object header 122, at least one digital signature 124, at least one embedded public encryption key 126 and a main application procedure 128 (often called a method). Each method or procedure 128 includes at least one verifier procedure call instruction 130 and instructions 132

for responding to a verification denial message received in response to the verifier procedure call, such as instructions for aborting execution of the procedure.”

McManis’ method includes at least one verifier procedure call (Fig. 1). McManis’ method does not perform any verification because an external verifier procedure is specified by McManis to perform such a task. Therefore, McManis’ method cannot be the equivalent of an access control function, let alone one whose implementation is defined by a class, as claimed. Thus, McManis does not disclose that a particular class defines an implementation of the access control function as claimed in the invention.

McManis therefore does not teach every aspect of the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 13, and 25 are therefore allowable.

Claims 2-12, and 14-24, and 26-36 are dependent upon Claims 1, 13, and 25, respectively, and are allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

II. CONCLUSIONS & MISCELLANEOUS


For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER
LLP

Dated: November 7, 2003


Kirk D. Wong
Reg. No. 43,284

1600 Willow Street
San Jose, CA 95125
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext.214
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on

11-7-03

by

